

## **REMARKS**

New claims, including two independent claims, have been added that are directed to highly specific methods. Note that the independent claims, Claims 38 and 46, have no limitations directed to coloration or pattern matching. Likewise, dependent Claims 39 and 47 include no limitations directed to coloration or pattern matching. In this sense, these claims enjoy similarities with those of US Patent 6,765,556, which is commonly owned with the present application. Claims 38 and 39 find support in Figures 3 and 4 of the specification; and Claims 46 and 47 find support in Figures 6 and 7 of the specification.

Various claims dependent from Claim 38 find support on page 13, lines 14-19 of the specification; and various claims dependent from Claim 46 find support on page 15, lines 3-11 of the specification.

Briefly, Claims 38 and 39 are directed to highly specific, letter-selection methods for use with a keyboard having letters arranged horizontally across the keys. Claims 46 and 47, on the other hand, are directed to highly specific, letter-selection methods for use with a keyboard having letters arranged vertically across the keys. The various dependent claims are directed to coloration or pattern layouts that reinforce the corresponding letter-selection method.

As explained on page 8, lines 3-6 of the specification with respect to the method described by Claim 38:

a consistent scheme is used, with each letter requiring two "taps" or key inputs. The first key to be inputted for a given letter is simply that key on which the letter appears; the second key in the sequence is in the same row

as the first key and is given by the position of the given letter within its corresponding group of letters.

Certain advantages of this method are explained on page 9, lines 3-8:

An advantage of the key coding sequences of FIGURE 3 is that the user enters letters by working within the same row, thereby reducing the time it takes to complete the two-key sequence, as a result of the shorter distance moved by the user's finger. Further, these sequences follow an intuitive, regular pattern, and therefore they are easier to execute. The pattern is such that a user can learn the two-key sequences well enough to be able to "type" in letters without even looking at the keys.

Likewise, the method described by Claim 46 enjoys similar advantages.

Note that with these methods, the order in which the keys are selected is crucial. By way of example, more than one letter can be selected using the numeral 4 key in combination with the numeral 6 key. For example, the relevant portions of Claim 38 read:

inputting the letter I into the electronic component by selecting, in order, the numeral 4 key and the numeral 6 key....

inputting the letter M into the electronic component by selecting, in order, the numeral 6 key and the numeral 4 key....

Thus, if the key sequence is reversed, a different letter is selected.

As noted above, the claimed subject matter is similar to that claimed in US Patent 6,765,556. For this reason, the Examiner may wish to consult with Henry N. Tran in Group Art Unit 2629, who was the Primary Examiner for that patent.

The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Eser Kandogan et al.

/Daniel E Johnson/

Daniel E. Johnson (Reg. No. 37,033)

Agent for Applicants

Phone (408) 927-3367

ARC920010111US1.am4.doc